

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47, 51, 56-59, 62-63, 72-74 and 77-78 are pending in the current application. Claims 56 and 72 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added in the current response.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47, 51, 56-59, 62-63, 72-74 and 77-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,449,598 of Green (“Green”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,619 of Byrne (“Byrne”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,845,255 of Mayaud (“Mayaud”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 includes the following limitation:

receiving a search request containing search criteria from a first user, wherein the search criteria includes at least one *search category*.

(Claim 1; emphasis added)

In contrast, Neither Green, Byrne, nor Mayaud teaches the above limitation of claim 1.

First, Green discloses “*storing* criteria for matching user attributes with document characteristics” (Green, col. 4, ln. 55-56). However, Green does not disclose, suggest, or imply that the criteria are contained in a search request received from a user.

Furthermore, Green discloses that the “search begins by choosing criteria” and the “criteria are chosen based on expert knowledge and historical data gather from previous searches” (Green, col. 7, ln. 42-46). In other words, the criteria in Green are chosen as

part of the search based on expert knowledge and historical data. Unlike the present invention as claimed, green does not disclose that the criteria are contained in a search request received from a user.

Second, Green discloses that, “[a] document characteristic may be an attribute, a document type or a *category*” (Green, col. 5, ln. 59-61). In other words, the “criteria” in Green are for matching user attributes with the “category” in Green. The “criteria” in Green does not include the “category” in Green. Thus, the “criteria” and the “category” in Green are distinct from the “criteria” and “category” set forth in claim 1. For at least these reasons, Green fails to teach the limitation set forth above for.

Regarding Byrne, the reference merely discloses performing a search based on organization (Byrne, Abstract; col. 8, ln. 17-29). Byrne does not disclose or suggest *receiving a search request containing search criteria from a first user*, wherein the search criteria includes at least one *search category*.

As to Mayaud, the reference merely discloses centrally inputting at the host computer facility patient-generated record-access specifications to determine which user organizations can access what data during what period (Mayaud, col. 18, ln. 6-13). Mayaud does not disclose or suggest *receiving a search request containing search criteria from a first user*, wherein the search criteria includes at least one *search category*.

Since none of Green, Byrne, and Mayaud discloses at least the limitations of claim 1 set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over Green in view of Byrne and Mayaud. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 24, 47, 56, and 72 as amended are patentable over Green, in view of Byrne and Mayaud for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The remaining claims 3-7, 10-13, 26-30, 33-36, 51, 57-59, 62-63, 73-74, and 77-78 depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims 1, 24, 47, 56, and 72, respectively. Therefore, claims 3-7, 10-13, 26-30, 33-36, 51, 57-59, 62-63, 73-74, and 77-78 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. If any other petition is necessary for consideration of this paper, it is hereby so petitioned.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: June 1, 2006



Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300